



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

first time the two most important sources of inspiration for Secundus, namely the *Osculum Panthiæ* of Philippus Beroaldus and Petrus Crinitus' poem *Ad Neæram*.

By far the most interesting chapter is the second, which has for its subject the influence of Secundus' graceful poems upon Neo-Latin as well as national literatures. As we trace this influence in the Netherlands, France, Italy, England and Germany, we are impressed with the number of great names among the imitators, translators, or admirers of Secundus; by the side of Ronsard and other poets of the Pleiad we find Philippe Desportes and later Mirabeau, and with Weckherlin, Opitz and Fleming stand Günther, Bürger and Goethe.

Regarding the relation of *Basia* to German literature, the editor combats the view, generally accepted, that Secundus affected very strongly the lyric poetry of Germany during the seventeenth century. The fact is brought out that in the first half of that century a direct influence of the Dutch poet can be proved only in a few cases, and it was not until the latter half of the eighteenth century that German poets—among them Bürger and Goethe—again drew inspiration from *Basia*.

MAX F. BLAU.

Adelphi College.

SPANISH DRAMA.

Ingratitud por Amor. Comedia de Don Guillen de Castro. Edited with an introduction by HUGO A. RENNERT, Professor of Romanic Languages and Literatures in the University of Pennsylvania. Publications of the University of Pennsylvania. Series in Philology, Literature and Archaeology, vol. vii, No. 1. Philadelphia: 1899. 8vo, 120 pp.

The text of the *Comedia* is preceded by an introduction of thirty-two pages which is divided into two parts; the first of these is a biographical and critical sketch, in which the editor also endeavors to fix the dates of certain events concerning the life and works of Guillen de Castro. The second part of the introduction is devoted to a discussion of the manuscript and of the play itself. The editor states at the outset that nothing of importance

concerning the life of Castro has been added to the material collected by Barrera; hence we find no attempt at a succinct history of the life of the poet, but rather such an arrangement of details as will lend itself more readily to a discussion of certain questions and to the adjustment of several disputed dates in the life of the author.

On pp. 11 ff. the editor discusses the question of an edition of Castro's plays previous to the year 1618. The dedication of the first part of the edition of 1621 contains the following:

"A book-seller more eager than courteous, during my absence printed these twelve comedies adding to their errors those of the printer."

Prof. Rennert agrees with Stiefel that the words quoted can hardly refer to the edition of 1618, because both editions had the same editor¹; but he does not think that Mérimée, as Stiefel maintains, has proven that Castro was in Valencia during the year 1618; this he promises to prove in the subsequent pages. It is strange that the editor does not recur to his promise; it may be inferred, however, that the evidence which he offers consists in the citation of the two licenses to print and sell as found in the edition of 1618—the one a license from the ecclesiastical authorities of Valencia, and the other from the civil authorities of Madrid. The evidence furnished by these two licenses, as the editor points out, seems to establish conclusively the fact that the edition of 1618 was printed with Castro's full consent. Consequently, when the preface to the edition of 1621 contains an allusion to a former unauthorized edition, that allusion must of necessity be to some other edition of which no copy has been discovered. The notice of a copy of the edition of 1618, together with the licenses and title page, constitute one of the most valuable features of the introduction, both in regard to the evidence furnished by the latter as to other editions, as well as for the fact that this is the first time, so far at least as I know, that any clue as to the existence of a copy of this edition has been put into print.

Two questions arise in regard to these

¹ *Zts. f. Rom. Phil.* xvi. p. 262.

licenses which may best be explained after an examination of the documents. The ecclesiastical license, printed on p. 3 of the edition of 1618, reads in part thus:

"Nos Pedro Antonio Serra . . . por el . . . Señor . . . Arçobispo de Valencia . . . por quanto por orden y comision nuestra ha visto y examinado el Dr. Juan Pasqual este libro intitulado Primera parte de las comedias compuestas por don Guillen de Castro; y hauernos hecho relacion que no ay en el cosa contra nuestra Santa Fe Catholica, y buenas costumbres, damos licencia y facultad que se pueda imprimir en esta ciudad, y Arçobispado: con tal empero que *antes que salga a luz*, y se vendan nos trayga el Autor o otra persona por el un libro de los impresos para ver si concuerda con su original dada en el Palacio Arçobispal de Valencia a *dos de Julio mdcxviii.*"

On p. 4 of the edition of 1618 is printed the following royal license:

"Por quanto por parte de vos don Guillen de Castro natural de la ciudad de Valencia, nos fue fecha relacion que *aviades compuesto e impresso con licencia* en la dicha ciudad de Valencia un libro de doze comedias . . . de que ante los del nuestro consejo fue fecha presentacion. Y nos fue pedido y suplicado, os mandasemos dar licencia para poder meter en estos nuestros Reynos de Castilla mil cuerpos que *teniaes impresos* del dicho libro en el dicho Reyno de Valencia . . . Por la qual os damos licencia y facultad para que la dicha impression de mil cuerpos del dicho libro que de suso se haze mencion que ansi estan en el dicho nuestro Reyno de Valencia, la podays meter en estos nuestros Reynos . . . Fecha en Madrid a *doze dias del mes de Junio de 1618* . . . Licencia a don Guillen de Castro . . . para que pueda meter en estos Reynos un libro de doze comedias que *ha impresso* con licencia en el dicho Reyno de Valencia . . ."

The editor referring to these two dates notices the discrepancy between that affixed to the King's license; namely, June 12, 1618, which speaks of the books as already printed, and that of the license of the Archbishop of Valencia, July 2, 1618, in which permission is given to print the book. Prof. Rennert thinks that the discrepancy might be removed if we supposed that the authentic date of the Archbishop's license was July 2, 1617, instead of July 2, 1618. But would this really obviate the difficulty? Since the license granted by the King speaks of the books as already printed, how could this license to

print be included in the book itself? Must we suppose that the licenses of the King and Archbishop were printed on a separate sheet, which was later inserted into the printed books? Both the discrepancy of the dates and the difficulty in accounting for the presence of the King's license, might be obviated if we supposed that at the time the license was granted by the King, Castro or the editor of his plays, had an edition of a thousand copies already printed with a previous license from the Archbishop of Valencia. It was one of these printed copies of the comedies which was presented to the King, or the commission appointed by him, when a request was made for a license to sell the book in the Kingdom of Castile; hence it is so plainly spoken of in the King's license as already printed. These first thousand copies were sold in Valencia; but upon receipt of the King's license to sell the book in Castile, application was again made to the Archbishop of Valencia for another license to print, which was granted in 1618; and both these licenses were included in another thousand copies which were destined to be sold in Castile.²

The editor now proceeds to prove the existence of an edition of Castro's plays anterior to 1618, and cites a portion of the prologue of the collection of *comedias* published at Valencia in 1625. It may be of interest to note that Barrera³ also quotes this prologue, the importance of which lies in the following statement:

" . . . Solo quiero advertirte que demás de imprimir estas doce comedias por hacer gusto á mi sobrina, lo hice tambien porque en mi ausencia se imprimieron otras doce, y tanto porque en ellas habia un sin fin de yerros como porque la que menos años tiene tendrá de puince arriba"

This seems to be strong evidence for the existence of an edition previous to 1518. Supposing that such an edition appeared in 1607 or 1608, and that it contained the same twelve plays which were afterward published in 1618, of which, however, it must be noted we have no positive proof, we get a clue as to the rela-

² The editor is in doubt as to whether the *tassa* was printed in Valencian books, and I might add to the example referred to by him, (p. 12, note 1) that of a book before me; namely, *Blanquerna* printed at Valencia in 1521, in which no such *tassa* is to be found.

³ *Catálogo*, p. 82.

tive dates of Lope de Vega's *Las Almenas de Tora* and Castro's *Las Mocedades del Cid*, which will enable us to accept a theory that has been posited as to the relations between the two plays. This theory which the editor advances tentatively (p. 16) is as follows: To judge merely from the dedication of Lope de Vega's *Las Almenas de Tora* to Don Guillen de Castro, we might conclude that this token of Lope's appreciation of Castro was prompted by the latter's *Dido*, whereas Lope's dedication was in reality a tribute to Castro on account of the latter's *Mocedades del Cid*. One reason for this conclusion is the fact that the *Cid* is one of the characters in Lope's *Almenas de Tora*. Has it slipped the editor's notice that this same theory had already been advanced by a Spanish scholar? Menéndez y Pelayo remarks:

"Dedicó Lope de Vega Las Almenas de Tora al insigne poeta valenciano D. Guillén de Castro; y siendo ésta la única fábula de su teatro en que aparece el Cid, puede conjeturarse que la dedicatoria fué un homenaje indirecto y delicado al gran ingenio que había puesto en las tablas las Mocedades del héroe. Hay que advertir, sin embargo, que Lope en la dedicatoria no hace alusión á ellas al paso que alaba encarecidamente la tragedia Dido de D. Guillén de Castro, y transcribe un soneto que compuso en loor de ella. Es cierto tambien que se ignora todavía la fecha en que fueron compuestas y representadas las dos partes de las Mocedades, cuya primera edición conocida es de 1621, aunque de los mismos preliminares del libro se infiere que hubo otra anterior, que será probablemente la de 1618, citada por Ximeno (Escritores del Reino de Valencia) de la cual hasta ahora no se ha encontrado ningún ejemplar. Y como esta primera y fraudulenta edición se hizo en ausencia de D. Guillén, según él mismo declara, algún tiempo hemos de suponer para que la pieza llegara á hacerse popular y á tentar la codicia del librero que la estampó sin consentimiento de su autor. No es para mí dudoso, por lo tanto, que *Las Almenas de Tora* se escribieron después de la segunda parte de las *Mocedades*, y que la dedicatoria nació del deseo de evitar toda sombra de rivalidad ó competencia."⁴

The discovery of an edition of 1618, and the strong presumption in favor of another and earlier edition, of Castro's *comedias* render it perfectly plausible that Lope dedicated his

Almenas de Tora to the Valencian poet as a tribute to the genius of the author of *Las Mocedades* rather than of *Dido*.

When the editor states that everything inclines to the belief that Castro left Italy during the year 1605, and again established himself in Valencia (p. 22), he apparently overlooks the evidence furnished by Lacroix,⁵ who, speaking of Castro's connection with the *Academia de los Nocturnos*, remarks:

"C'est probablement à la suite d'une de ces aventures galantes qui aurait mal tourné que notre héros fut obligé de s'expatrier. Nous le retrouvons en effet à la cour de Naples où le vice-roi, D. Juan Pimentel de Herrera, comte de Bénavent, lui confia le gouvernement de Scigliano."

To complete the evidence, the same writer adds:

"Les lettres patentes sont datées du 1er Juin, 1607 'Pro uno anno integro et deinde in antea ad beneplacitum cum pensione, lucris, gagiis, et indumentis solitis, etc.'"⁶

The above citations show clearly that Castro could not have left Italy in 1605. Furthermore, we might be led to a similar inference from the following: 1 We know Castro to have been in Valencia on the 14th of January, 1604 (p. 8), and it seems improbable that he should have gone to Italy, assumed charge of the government of Scigliano, and returned to Valencia before the close of 1605. 2 It is probable that some time before 1616 (Prof. Rennert himself maintains before 1613 or in that year), there appeared the unauthorized edition of his *Comedias* referred to in the editions of 1621 and 1625. Now, no doubt, the fact that Castro was residing at a very great distance from Valencia was what tempted the Valencian editor to bring out an edition of the *Comedias* without Castro's consent, which perhaps he would not have ventured to do had Castro been residing within such easy reach of Valencia as Madrid, where Prof. Rennert supposes him to have been during the period in which he speaks of himself as absent from Valencia (p. 23). This, then, would lead us to conclude, not only that Castro did not return to Valencia in 1605, but that he re-

⁵ *Las Mocedades del Cid*. Texte de l'édition princeps commenté et annoté . . . par Ernest Lacroix, Paris, 1897, p. 2.

⁶ *Ibid*, note 3.

⁴ *Obras de Lope de Vega*, vol. vii. Madrid, 1898, p. xxii.

mained in Italy up to, or even later, than 1613. This seems also to be the opinion of Lacroix, who supposes that Castro was called to the court of the viceroy of Naples, the Count of Lemos, the most assiduous patron of literary men, who succeeded the Count of Benevento in 1609. Finally Lacroix adds: "Il ne paraît, en effet, que bien plus tard à Valence, où il ressuscite l'Académie des Montañeses del Parnaso."⁸

We know that many of Castro's plays were written early, and that some of them soon became popular, nevertheless no authorized edition of his works appeared before 1618. 9

These facts lead us to the conclusion that some unusual event in the author's life had caused him to delay the preparation of an edition of his plays. This event might well have been a prolonged stay in Italy during which the vigor of his literary energies had been somewhat abated by his military or political duties.

The editor states that in 1603 Castro probably left for Italy to assume the governorship of Scigliano (p. 23). He seems here to have forgotten the fact already noted by himself (p. 8); namely, that Castro was in Valencia on January 14, 1604; since he is mentioned by Tárrega as taking part in a *Juego de Cañas* on that day.

Part II of the introduction is devoted to a discussion of the manuscript and the play itself. The editor, upon internal evidence of defective rhyme and missing verses, discredits the statements of Schack and Barrera that the manuscript is an autograph. He is also of the opinion that Act iii is falsely attributed in the manuscript to Calderón, basing his conclusion upon the belief that Castro and Calderón never worked in collaboration, and also upon the fact that the third act constitutes the weakest portion of the drama.

The play, which is here published for the first time, is divided into three *jornadas*. The last act is particularly noticeable among other defects for the weakness of intrigue. We might,

⁸ L. c., p. 2.

⁹ It should be noted, however, that two single plays, *El Amor Constante* and *El Caballero Bobo* were published in the *Doce Comedias de Cuatro Poetas Naturales de la Insigne y Coronada Ciudad de Valencia*. Valencia, 1608, and Barcelona, 1609.

on this account, be led to suppose that the first two acts are alone to be attributed to Castro, and that after his death an unknown dramatist having discovered the unfinished manuscript was tempted to bring the play to completion by writing the third act, and hoping to add lustre to his own inferior work, ascribed it to Calderón. The fact that the handwriting of the manuscript is not the same throughout does not militate against the theory, as we might suppose the completer of the play to have copied the first two acts from the original manuscript, adding his own act to the new copy.

FRANCIS L. FROST.

Johns Hopkins University.

OBITUARY.

PROFESSOR EUGEN KÖLBING.

DIED AUGUST 9, 1899.

The sudden death of the Professor of English at Breslau deprived English Philology of one of its most distinguished representatives, and the Modern Language students at this university of one of the most indefatigable and esteemed of teachers.

Eugen Kölbing was born on September 21, 1846, in Herrnhut, his father being a physician of that place. After obtaining the certificate of maturity at Bautzen, he proceeded to the University of Leipzig to devote himself to the study of the Classics and Teutonic Philology. He was here especially attracted by Zarncke's Lectures on Old Norse.

In 1868 he graduated, with his dissertation *On the Norse Parzival Saga and its Source*, and at Easter, 1869, he passed the State examination.

After absolving his probationary year (as a master) at the Holy Cross Gymnasium at Dresden, he was employed at the Gymnasiums of Schneeberg and Chemnitz, and, afterwards, for a year (1892-3) at the Strassburg Library, under Barack. It was at this time, too, that his *Investigations on the Omission of the Relative Pronoun in the Teutonic Languages* appeared, as well as a *Contribution to the Syntax of the Compound Sentence*, Strassburg, 1872, and his first Norse publication of importance, the edition of the *Riddara Sögur*,